



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Am

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,696	08/31/2001	Dietrich Charisius	TS1005	2131
23485	7590	06/01/2005	EXAMINER	
JINAN GLASGOW 300 N. GREENE ST., SUITE 1600 P.O. BOX 2974 GREENSBORO, NC 27401			STORK, KYLE R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/944,696	CHARISIUS ET AL.
	Examiner Kyle R Stork	Art Unit 2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 3-17,28-31 and 38-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 3-17,28-31 and 38-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed 05 April 2005.
2. Claims 3-17, 28-31, and 38-44 are pending. Claims 3, 13, 28, 38, 41, and 44 are independent claims. The rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103 under the combinations of Boden, Nauckhoff, Is, Kumahiro, and Garofalakis have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3-10, 13-15, 38, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boden et al. (US 5930512, patent date 1999, hereafter Boden) in further view of Nauckhoff (US 5893128, patent date 1999) and further in view of Microsoft® Word 2000 (1999, hereafter Word).

As per independent claim 3, Boden discloses a method in a data processing system having versions of a plan, each reflecting an instance in an edit history, the method comprising the steps of displaying a plan in a sequential manner to simulate animation of the edit history (column 10, lines 30-34: Here, the process model is equivalent to the plan, while animation from the beginning is reflecting the edit history).

Boden fails to specifically disclose storing indications of the versions of the plan. However, Nauckhoff discloses storing indications of the versions of the plan (column 7, lines 26-56: Here, marking the last committed version is storing indications of the version of the plan. Further, because a rollback of the system is possible, an earlier version of the plan must be stored). Word further discloses displaying a frequency of change in the edit history (pages 1-2: Here, a user can track the changes made to a document or compare changes between documents).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden's method of displaying a plan with Nauckhoff's method of storing versions of a plan, since it would have allowed a user to graphically view the sequential steps leading up to a version. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden and Nauckhoff's method with Word's method, since it would have allowed a user to compare collaborative changes made to a document (Word: page 2).

As per dependent claim 4, Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 3, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden further discloses creating a link from the plan to the task (column 2, lines 63-65: Here, a hot link links to the task). Nauckhoff discloses storing a version of the task of the plan (column 7, lines 26-56: Here, a rollback is possible, meaning that beside the current version of the plan, an earlier version must also be present).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word's method of linking from the plan to the task with Nauckhoff's method of storing versions, since it would have allowed the user to navigate several versions of a plan more easily.

As per dependent claim 5, Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 3, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden further discloses the method wherein the versions of the plan reflect an activation of the plan (Figure 5: Here, the "STATUS" of tasks in the work list displays activation of the plan).

As per dependent claim 6, Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 5, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden further discloses the method wherein the plan comprises a plurality of tasks and the indications of the versions of the plan comprise the states of the tasks (Figure 5: Here, the items listed under "DESCRIPTION" are the plurality of tasks, while the "STATUS" displays the states of the tasks).

As per dependent claim 7, Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 6, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden further discloses the method wherein the state comprises an unexecuted state (Figure 5: Here, the "READY" and "SUSPENDED" states are equivalent to the unexecuted state).

As per dependent claim 8, Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 6, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden further discloses the method wherein the state comprises an executing state (Figure 5: Here, the "RUNNING" state is equivalent to the executing state).

As per dependent claim 9, Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 6, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden further discloses the method wherein the state comprises an executed state (column 7, lines 6-26: Here, the exit state is the equivalent of an executed state).

As per dependent claim 10, Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 3, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden further discloses the method wherein the indications of the plan reflect modifications to the plan (column 8, lines 56-61: Here modifications of the plan are translated in order to reflect changes in the plan).

As per independent claim 13, Boden discloses a method in a data processing system having versions of a workflow, each reflecting an instance in an edit history, the method comprising the steps of displaying a workflow in a sequential manner to simulate animation of the edit history (column 10, lines 30-34: Here, the process model is equivalent to the workflow, while animation from the beginning is reflecting the edit history). Boden fails to specifically disclose storing indications of the versions of the workflow. However, Nauckhoff discloses storing indications of the versions of the workflow (column 7, lines 26-56: Here, marking the last committed version is storing indications of the version of the workflow. Further, because a rollback of the system is possible, an earlier version of the workflow must be stored). Word further discloses displaying a frequency of change in the edit history (pages 1-2: Here, a user can track the changes made to a document or compare changes between documents).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden's method of displaying a workflow with Nauckhoff's method of storing versions of a workflow, since it would have allowed a user to graphically view the sequential steps leading up to a version. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden and Nauckhoff's method with Word's method, since it would have allowed a user to compare collaborative changes made to a document (Word: page 2).

As per dependent claim 14, Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 13, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden further discloses creating a link from the workflow to the activity (column 2, lines 63-65: Here, a hot link links to the activity). Nauckhoff discloses storing a version of the activity of the workflow (column 7, lines 26-56: Here, a rollback is possible, meaning that beside the current version of the workflow, an earlier version must also be present).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word's method of linking from the workflow to the activity with Nauckhoff's method of storing versions, since it would have allowed the user to navigate several versions of a workflow more easily.

As per dependent claim 15, Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 13, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden further discloses the method wherein the indications of the workflow reflect

modifications to the workflow (column 8, lines 56-61: Here modifications of the workflow are translated in order to reflect changes in the workflow).

As per independent claim 28, Boden discloses the computer-readable medium containing instructions for controlling a data processing system to perform a method, the method comprising the steps of displaying a workflow plan in a sequential manner to simulate the generation of the plans from the workflow (column 10, lines 30-34). Boden fails to specifically disclose retrieving a plurality of plans from a workflow. However, Nauckhoff discloses retrieving a plurality of plans from a workflow (column 4, lines 28-36: Here, plans are retrieved from a database for processing by application programs). Word further discloses displaying a frequency of change in the edit history (pages 1-2: Here, a user can track the changes made to a document or compare changes between documents).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden's method of displaying plans with Nauckhoff's method of retrieving plans, since it would have allowed a user to view retrieved plans. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden and Nauckhoff's method with Word's method, since it would have allowed a user to compare collaborative changes made to a document (Word: page 2).

As per independent claim 38, the applicant discloses the data processing system for execution of the method of claim 13. Nauckhoff further discloses a memory device

and a secondary storage device (column 4, lines 28-36). Claim 38 is similarly rejected under Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word.

As per independent claim 41, the applicant discloses the data processing system for execution of the method of claim 3. Nauckhoff further discloses a memory device and a secondary storage device (column 4, lines 28-36). Claim 41 is similarly rejected under Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word.

As per independent claim 44, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 3. Claim 44 is similarly rejected under Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word.

5. Claims 11, 16, 30, 39, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word and further in view of Is (2000, found on page 7, line 2).

As per dependent claim 11, Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 3, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden and Nauckhoff fail to specifically disclose the method wherein the versions of the plan are displayed in reverse order. However, Is discloses listing in reverse order (page 2: Here, the –r option reverses the order of sort alphabetically or according to time).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word's method of displaying versions with Is's method for reversing the order, since it would have allowed a user to view the plan in an alternative order.

As per dependent claim 16, Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 13, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden and Nauckhoff fail to specifically disclose the method wherein the versions of the workflow are displayed in reverse order. However, Is discloses listing in reverse order (page 2: Here, the –r option reverses the order of sort alphabetically or according to time).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word's method of displaying versions with Is's method for reversing the order, since it would have allowed a user to view the workflow in an alternative order.

As per dependent claim 30, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 11. Claim 30 is similarly rejected under Boden, Nauckhoff, Word, and Is.

As per dependent claim 39, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 16. Claim 39 is similarly rejected under Boden, Nauckhoff, Word, and Is.

As per dependent claim 42, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 11. Claim 42 is similarly rejected under Boden, Nauckhoff, Word, and Is.

6. Claims 12, 17, 40, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word and further in view of Kumashiro (US 6240395, patent 2001, file 1998).

As per dependent claim 12, Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 3, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden and

Nauckhoff fail to specifically disclose the method wherein the display comprises a Gantt chart. Kumashiro discloses a Gantt chart (column 10. lines 38-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word's method of displaying a plan with Kumashiro's method of displaying a Gantt chart, since it would have allowed a user to view a representation of time to be spent on a task.

As per dependent claim 17, Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 13, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden and Nauckhoff fail to specifically disclose the method wherein the display comprises a flow diagram. Kumashiro discloses a flow diagram (column 10. lines 38-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word's method of displaying a plan with Kumashiro's method of displaying a flow diagram, since it would have allowed a user to view a representation of time to be spent on a task.

As per dependent claim 31, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 12. Claim 31 is similarly rejected under Boden, Nauckhoff, Word, and Kumashiro.

As per dependent claim 40, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 17. Claim 40 is similarly rejected under Boden, Nauckhoff, Word, and Kumashiro.

As per dependent claim 43, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 12. Claim 43 is similarly rejected under Boden, Nauckhoff, Word, and Kumashiro.

7. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word in further view of Garofalakis et al. (1998, hereafter Garofalakis).

As per dependent claim 29, Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 28, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden and Nauckhoff fail to specifically disclose the medium further comprising the steps of:

- Receiving an indication of a rate of display
- Setting a time period equal to a reciprocal of the rate
- Pausing for the time period before displaying each of the plans

Garofalakis discloses:

- Receiving an indication of a rate of display (column 4, line 60- column 5, line 8:
(Here, the per stream disk bandwidth requirement is the rate of display)
- Setting a time period equal to a reciprocal of the rate (column 4, line 60- column 5, line 8: Here, this time period is the time period required to retrieve the requested data and is a reciprocal of the display frequency)
- Pausing for the time period before displaying each of the plans (column 4, line 60- column 5, line 8: Here, the time necessary to retrieve the data is the paused time period before display)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden, Nauckhoff, and Word's medium for retrieving plans with Garofalakis's medium for display, since it would have allowed a user to receive the data based upon the equipment he/she was using.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3-17, 28-31, and 38-44 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

As detailed above, the Word reference has been added to address the amended features.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:00-3:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (703) 308-5465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krs



CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER